arXiv:1606.05811v2 [math.OC] 18 Nov 2016

Every rational polyhedron has finite split rank: new proof.

Kanstantsin Pashkovich[1]

Abstract

Split rank of a rational polyhedron is finite. The well known proof of this is based on the fact that split closure is stronger than the Chvátal closure, and the Chvátal rank of a rational polyhedron is finite due to the result of Chvátal and Schrijver. In this note we provide an independent proof for the fact that every rational polyhedron has finite split rank. In principal, we construct a nonnegative potential function which decreases by at least one with "every" second split closure unless the integer hull of the polyhedron is reached.

The *split closure* of a polyhedron $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ can be defined in the following way

$$\mathcal{S}(Q) := \bigcap_{c \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \text{conv}(Q \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ cx \in \mathbb{Z}\}).$$

Alternatively, the split closure of Q can be defined as follows

$$\bigcap_{c \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \bigcap_{\delta \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{conv}\big((Q \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ cx \leq \delta\}) \cup (Q \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ cx \geq \delta + 1\}) \big),$$

because for all $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\bar{x} \in \text{conv}\big(\{x \in Q : \ cx \in \mathbb{Z}\}\big) \iff \bar{x} \in \text{conv}\big(\{x \in Q : \ cx = \lfloor c\bar{x} \rfloor \text{ or } \ cx = \lceil c\bar{x} \rceil\}\big).$$

Cook, Kannan and Schrijver [4] proved that if Q is a rational polyhedron, then $\mathcal{S}(Q)$ is a rational polyhedron as well. Alternative proofs of this result can be found in [1], [5] and [7], see also Theorem 5.10 in [3].

Clearly, for any polyhedron $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\text{conv}(Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(Q) \subseteq Q$. Furthermore if Q is a rational polyhedron and $\text{conv}(Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) \subsetneq Q$, then $\mathcal{S}(Q) \subsetneq Q$. So if we let $\mathcal{S}^0(Q) := Q$ and iteratively define $\mathcal{S}^t(Q) := \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^{t-1}(Q))$, then these polyhedra provide increasingly tighter outer approximations of $\text{conv}(Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$. The *split rank* of a polyhedron Q is the smallest t for which $\mathcal{S}^t(Q) = \text{conv}(Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$. In fact, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Every rational polyhedron has finite split rank.*

In this note, we provide an independent proof of Theorem 1. A well known proof of this theorem relies on Chvátal closure. The Chvátal closure of a polyhedron is a fundamental concept in integer programming and combinatorial optimization, see [3] Chapter 5.

Theorem 2 ([2],[6])**.** *For a rational polyhedron $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{conv}(Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$ can be obtained by iteratively taking the Chátal closures a finite number of times.*

Since the split closure of a polyhedron is contained in the Chvátal closure, the following Observation 3 shows that Theorem 2 implies Theorem 1.

[1]Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo.(kanstantsin.pashkovich@gmail.com)

Observation 3. *Given polyhedra P, Q, such that $P \subseteq Q$ and $(P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) = (Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$, the split rank of P is less than or equal to the split rank of Q.*

In the remaining part of the note, we present our independent proof of Theorem 1.

1 The proof of the main result

Throughout this section we let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty rational polyhedron and we let $P := \text{conv}(Q \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$.

Claim 1. *There exists an integral system $Cx \leq a$ that defines P and a vector $b \geq a$ such that $Q \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ Cx \leq b\}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that there exists an integral system of inequalities $Cx \leq a$ that defines P such that $\text{rec}(Q) \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ Cx \leq 0\}$.

Meyer's Theorem, see Theorem 4.30 in [3], states that if Q is a rational polyhedron, then P is a rational polyhedron and $\text{rec}(P) = \text{rec}(Q)$ whenever $P \neq \varnothing$. So if $P \neq \varnothing$ any minimal inequality description of P satisfies the lemma. Assume now $P = \varnothing$, then let $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a zero vector, $a = -1$ and $b = 0$, finishing the proof. □

Let C be a matrix satisfying Claim 1. To prove Theorem 1 it is enough to show that for every row $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ of C there exists some t such that the corresponding inequality

$$cx \leq \alpha \quad \text{holds for all} \quad x \in \mathcal{S}^t(Q)\,. \tag{1}$$

Fix a row $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ of C. Let us assume that there is no t such that (1) holds.

Consider the face $F := \{x \in \text{rec}(Q) : \ cx = 0\}$ of $\text{rec}(Q)$. Since F is a nonempty face of $\text{rec}(Q)$, there exist $k := n - \dim(F)$ linearly independent vectors g_i, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ such that inequalities $g_i x \leq 0$ are valid for $\text{rec}(Q)$ and $F = \{x \in \text{rec}(Q) : g_i x = 0, i = 1, \ldots, k\}$.

It is not hard to see that there is a lattice basis $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for $\mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ lie in $\text{cone}(g_1, \ldots, g_k)$. This is due to the fact that $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ form a lattice basis for $\mathbb{Z}^n$ if and only if the parallelepiped spanned by $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ and the origin contains no integral point in its interior[2]. Due to the construction, we have that

$$F \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ w_i x = 0, i = 1, \ldots, k\}\,. \tag{2}$$

For $i = 1, \ldots, k$ define

$$M_i := \max\{0, \lceil - \min_{\{x \in Q : cx \geq \alpha\}} w_i x \rceil, \lceil \max_{\{x \in Q\}} w_i x \rceil\}\,. \tag{3}$$

[2] A most straightforward way to choose the desired lattice basis $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ is to take a lattice-free parallelepiped in $\text{cone}(g_1, \ldots, g_k)$ going through origin, and choose the neighbours of the origin in this parallelepiped as the vectors $w_1, \ldots, w_k$. It is easy to see, that $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ can be extended to a lattice basis for $\mathbb{Z}^n$.

Before moving further let us clarify why the maximum and minimum appearing in the definition exist. Note, that $w_1,\dots,w_k$ are conic combinations of $g_1,\dots, g_k$, where linear functions corresponding to $g_1,\dots, g_k$ achieve maximum over Q. On the other hand, we may assume $\{x \in Q : cx \geq \alpha\} \neq \varnothing$, since otherwise (1) trivially holds for Q. Moreover, the polyhedron $\{x \in Q : cx \geq \alpha\}$ is not only nonempty, but its recession cone equals F and each of the vectors $w_1,\dots, w_k$ is orthogonal to F by (2), showing that linear functions corresponding to $w_1,\dots, w_k$ achieve minimum over $\{x \in Q : cx \geq \alpha\}$. Hence, $M_i < \infty$ for every $i = 1,\dots,k$.

For $i = 1,\dots,k$ define the directions

$$d_0 := c \quad \text{and} \quad d_i := (2M_i + 1)d_{i-1} + w_i. \tag{4}$$

Denote $\mathcal{D} := \{d_0,\dots,d_k\}$ and define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(Q) := \bigcap_{d\in\mathcal{D}} \operatorname{conv}\big(Q \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : dx \in \mathbb{Z}\}\big)$$

and let $\mathcal{S}^0_{\mathcal{D}}(Q) := Q$, $\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q) := \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{S}^{t-1}_{\mathcal{D}}(Q))$.

Since $\mathcal{D}$ is finite, it is clear that $\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q)$ is a polyhedron for every t. If $\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q) = \varnothing$ for some t then (1) trivially holds, finishing the proof. Moreover, since $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \operatorname{cone}(c, g_1,\dots,g_k)$ we can define $u^t_d := \max_{x\in\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q)} dx < \infty$ for every t and every $d \in \mathcal{D}$.

Claim 2. *For every t and every $d \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $u^{t+1}_d \leq u^t_d$. Moreover, if $u^{t+1}_d < u^t_d$ then $u^{t+2}_d \leq u^t_d - 1$ or $u^{t+1}_d \leq u^{t-1}_d - 1$.*

Proof. The inequality $u^{t+1}_d \leq u^t_d$ trivially holds. Moreover, if both u^{t+1}_d and u^t_d are integral, then the second statement of the claim holds as well. Let $u^t_d \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then

$$u^{t+1}_d \leq \lfloor u^t_d \rfloor = \lceil u^t_d \rceil - 1 \leq u^{t-1}_d - 1\,.$$

The case $u^{t+1}_d \notin \mathbb{Z}$ is analogous. □

Due to Claim 2 for $d := c$, we have either $\lim_{t\to\infty} u^t_c = -\infty$ or there are $t_c, \gamma_c \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u^t_c = \gamma_c$ for every $t \geq t_c$. In the first case, (1) trivially holds for some t. So we may assume that there are t_c and $\gamma_c \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u^t_c = \gamma_c$ for every $t \geq t_c$. If $\gamma_c \leq \alpha$ then (1) holds for $t = t_c$, so we can assume $\gamma_c > \alpha$.

Let us prove that for every $d \in \mathcal{D}$ there exist t_d, $\gamma_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u^t_d = \gamma_d$ for $t \geq t_d$. To do this, it is enough to show that $\lim_{t\to\infty} u^t_d \neq -\infty$ for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$, i.e. it is enough to show that the sequence u^t_d is bounded from below. Using $\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : cx = \gamma_c\} \neq \varnothing$, we have

$$u^t_d = \max_{x\in\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q)} dx \geq \max_{\substack{x\in\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q)\\ cx=\gamma_c}} dx \geq \min_{\substack{x\in\mathcal{S}^t_{\mathcal{D}}(Q)\\ cx=\gamma_c}} dx \geq \min_{\substack{x\in Q\\ cx=\gamma_c}} dx\,.$$

Note that $\min_{\{x\in Q:\, cx=\gamma_c\}} dx \neq -\infty$ because the recession cone of $Q \cap \{x :\, cx = \gamma_c\}$ equals F, and hence is orthogonal to d.

Hence, we may assume that for every $d \in \mathcal{D}$ there exist t_d, $\gamma_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u^t_d = \gamma_d$ for every $t \geq t_d$. Define $t_{\mathcal{D}} := \max\{t_d :\, d \in \mathcal{D}\}$.

Claim 3. *For $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have*

$$\{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}+1}(Q) : d_i x = \gamma_{d_i}\} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d_{i-1} x = \gamma_{d_{i-1}}\}. \tag{5}$$

Proof. To prove that (5) holds for $i := j+1$, we may assume that for $i = 1, \dots, j+1$ we have

$$\{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}+1}(Q) : d_{i-1} x = \gamma_{d_{i-1}}\} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : cx = \gamma_c\}. \tag{6}$$

To show (5), let us define $Q_{d_{i-1}} := \mathrm{conv}(\{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}}(Q) : d_{i-1} x \in \mathbb{Z}\})$. Since $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}+1}(Q) \subseteq Q_{d_{i-1}}$, to show (5) it is enough to prove that

$$\{x \in Q_{d_{i-1}} : d_i x = \gamma_{d_i}\} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d_{i-1} x = \gamma_{d_{i-1}}\}. \tag{7}$$

Let us assume the contrary, i.e. there is a vertex $\bar{x}$ of $Q_{d_{i-1}}$ such that $d_i \bar{x} = \gamma_{d_i}$ and $d_{i-1}\bar{x} \leq \gamma_{d_{i-1}} - 1$. Take any point $x^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}+1}(Q)$ such that $d_{i-1} x^* = \gamma_{d_{i-1}}$. By (6) we have $cx^* = \gamma_c \geq \alpha$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_i \bar{x} - d_i x^* = (2M_i + 1) d_{i-1} \bar{x} + w_i \bar{x} - (2M_i + 1) d_{i-1} x^* - w_i x^* \leq \\ (2M_i + 1)(\gamma_{d_{i-1}} - 1) + \max_{x \in Q} w_i x - (2M_i + 1)\gamma_{d_{i-1}} - \min_{\{x \in Q : cx \geq \alpha\}} w_i x \leq \\ (2M_i + 1)(\gamma_{d_{i-1}} - 1) + M_i - (2M_i + 1)\gamma_{d_{i-1}} + M_i \leq -1, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting $d_i \bar{x} \geq d_i x^*$ and showing that (7) holds. □

Claim 4. *The polyhedron Q contains an integral point x such that $cx = \gamma_c$.*

Proof. Let x^* be a vertex of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}+1}(Q)$ such that $d_k x^* = \gamma_{d_k}$. By Claim 3 we have $dx^* = \gamma_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $d \in \mathcal{D}$, using (4) we get $w_i x^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Due to $\dim(F) = n - k$ and to (2) we can find $r \in F$ such that $w_i(x^* + r) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $i = k+1, \dots, n$. Thus, $w_i(x^* + r) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ because $w_i(x^* + r) = w_i x^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$. Since $w_i, \dots, w_n$ form a lattice basis for $\mathbb{Z}^n$, $(x^* + r) \in Q$ is an integral point and $c(x^* + r) = cx^* = \gamma_c$, finishing the proof. □

Thus Q contains an integral point x such that $cx = \gamma_c$, implying $\gamma_c \leq \alpha$. Hence (1) holds for $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{t_{\mathcal{D}}}(Q)$, contradiction. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.

Acnowledgement

I would like to thank Michele Conforti for motivating me to do this research. I profited from many discussions with Michele Conforti both on proofs and exposition of the note.

I am also grateful for the support of the Hausdorff Institute for Mathematics in Bonn, Germany, as well as the organizers of its trimester program on Combinatorial Optimization; part of this work was done during my stay there.

This note was finalized and presented for the first time during a research stay at Institute for Discrete Mathematics, University of Bonn. I am very grateful to the Institute for Discrete Mathematics, and particularly to Jens Vygen, for hosting me in Bonn.

References

[1] Kent Andersen, Gérard Cornuéjols, and Yanjun Li. Split closure and intersection cuts. *Math. Program.*, 102(3, Ser. A):457–493, 2005.

[2] V. Chvátal. Edmonds polytopes and a hierarchy of combinatorial problems. *Discrete Math.*, 4:305–337, 1973.

[3] Michele Conforti, Gérard Cornuéjols, and Giacomo Zambelli. *Integer programming*, volume 271 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2014.

[4] W. Cook, R. Kannan, and A. Schrijver. Chvátal closures for mixed integer programming problems. *Math. Programming*, 47(2, (Ser. A)):155–174, 1990.

[5] Sanjeeb Dash, Oktay Günlük, and Andrea Lodi. On the MIR closure of polyhedra. In *Integer programming and combinatorial optimization*, volume 4513 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 337–351. Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[6] A. Schrijver. On cutting planes. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 9:291–296, 1980. Combinatorics 79 (Proc. Colloq., Univ. Montréal, Montreal, Que., 1979), Part II.

[7] Juan Pablo Vielma. A constructive characterization of the split closure of a mixed integer linear program. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 35(1):29–35, 2007.